

## REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated 30 July 2007. Applicants will address the matters set forth in the Office Action in the same order.

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants thank the Examiner for the kind telephone interview extended on 18 December 2007. Applicants' attorney discussed the prior art relied upon in the most recent Office Action vis-à-vis the claims submitted for discussion. Subject to reviewing the art, and refining the "thickness" wording in proposed amended Claim 12, the Examiner indicated that the amendments appear to overcome the art of record.

Applicants' amendments herein are consistent with the discussion in the interview.

### DRAWINGS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as not showing "traction lugs extending across the width of the track, and extending across only a majority of the width of the track as set forth in Claims 7, 12, 19, and 21..." In response, applicants have amended these claims.

Specifically regarding Claim 7, applicants have deleted the language "substantially all of" from the claim.

Regarding Claims 12, 19, and 21, applicants have replaced the offending language with "at least an interval of the width..." Such language is supported in the originally filed specification on page 5, second full paragraph.

### SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to language regarding the traction lugs "extending across a majority of the width of the base. In response, applicants have amended Claim 7, 12, and 19 as discussed above. Furthermore, applicants note that the term "width" is


25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 7 -

ACAS-1-1037ROA3

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM <sup>TM</sup>LLC

  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301

used on page 5, third paragraph and the term “base” is used throughout page 4 of the originally filed specification. Applicants have used these terms consistent with their use in the application as filed.

#### SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112 due to the specification having no description of the traction lugs extending across a majority of the width of the base. Figure 9 illustrates such an embodiment. However, as mentioned above, applicants have revised the offending language.

#### SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 12, 21, and 22 as being anticipated by Cartwright and Claims 12, 16, 21, 22, and 23 over Fischer. The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-23 as being anticipated by Masaoka et al. and Claim 19 as being anticipated by Simmons ‘221.

With regard to Cartwright, applicants bring the Examiner’s attention to the configuration of Cartwright including a rigid anchor plate or bar 28. This is the feature that includes the differing angle rather than the elastomeric lug. Furthermore, the Cartwright lugs are not unitary with the base. The claims, as amended, define over Cartwright.

With regard to Fischer, applicants have amended the claims to recite the thickness of the lug being less than the lug height. Fischer teaches a large lug foundation with a “TD” trailing distance that is large to provide strong tread support without excessive wear. Applicants’ lugs do not follow the teachings of Fischer. The claims, as amended, define over Fischer.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the Masaoka *et al.* reference does not include lower and upper portions with different angles. Figure 2, to which the Examiner refers, shows lower and upper portions, both extending normal to the track base. The additional figures

show non-symmetrical lugs, but not that have differing angles between portions. Furthermore, Claim 21, as amended, includes thickness description that is not found in Masaoka *et al.*

With regard to Simmons and Claim 19, applicants have made amendments that define over the reference. Specifically, applicants have added that after the track is selectively secured with one track lug inclination, the track is secured in the opposite direction. Such is not taught by Simmons. Simmons teaches only the advantages of attaching the separate lugs in one direction.

### 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious in view of Simmons '221. Claim 20 depends from Claim 19, discussed above. Furthermore, indicia on a track regarding switching of the track is not obvious in view of a reference that teaches only one way to attach a track.

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for his indication that Claims 7, 17, and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record, and that Claims 13-15 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended Claim to make it independent, such that it is now allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe they have addresses all matters raised in the Office Action and interview. Applicants respectfully request an early indication of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>



Darren J. Jones  
Registration No. 36,175  
Direct Dial: 206.957.2490

22 Jan 08  
DATED

25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 9 -

ACAS-1-1037ROA3

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301